

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 12, and 24 are amended by way of this response. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraph 0045 of the application, as originally filed.

In the Office Action dated December 23, 2008, the Examiner objects to the specification as not containing a description of what can be included as the “computer readable medium” of claim 24. The Examiner asserts that the specification does not clarify what types of computer readable media are included in the term “computer readable medium.”

Further, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,796 to Siitonen et al. (“Siitonen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,950,988 to Hawkins et al. (“Hawkins”) and U.S. Publication No. 2004/0155908 to Wagner (“Wagner”). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s obviousness rejections for the reasons that follow. Regardless, for the purpose of advancing the prosecution of this case, the Applicant has amended the independent claims to clearly take the claims outside of the scope of what is disclosed by Siitonen, Hawkins and/or Wagner.

The Specification Provides Proper Antecedent Basis for the Claimed Subject Matter.

According to 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1): “The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description.”

The specification clearly refers to “computer software medium embodying code for carrying out the method” (paragraph 0007) and to “a computer program product having a computer readable medium tangibly embodying computer executable code” (paragraph 0013). Further, the term “computer readable medium” is well known in the art. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that a person skilled in the art would easily be able to ascertain the meaning of the term “computer readable medium” by reference to the description, as required by 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

The Applicant is not aware of any legislation or case law which requires that the types of products included in a well known term such as “computer readable medium” be explicitly listed in the specification. In fact, the Applicant respectfully submits that such a requirement would be grossly unfair as computer technology, including computer readable medium technology, evolves quickly. An applicant for a computer-related invention cannot be expected to anticipate all the types of computer readable mediums on which their invention may, in the future, be stored.

The References Do Not Disclose All of the Features of Applicant’s Claims.

The Action alleges that Siitonen, Hawkins and Wagner disclose the subject matter of claim 1. The Applicant submits that, even *if* Siitonen, Hawkins and Wagner were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, these references do not disclose every feature of each one of Applicant’s claims.

The cited references do not disclose a user interface comprising a home screen component, having an application portion displaying application icons for activating associated applications and a mobile status portion, and wherein the component to compose a destination being invokable from the home screen component manually by activating a communication application icon and automatically in response to an input from the first input device of a portion of the destination.

The Applicant continues to emphatically disagree with the Examiner's assertion that the contacts page shown in Figure 5 of Hawkins can be considered a home screen as commonly understood in the art and as defined in the present application. However, for the purposes of advancing prosecution of this case, claim 1 has been amended to further specify that the component to compose a destination is invokable from the home screen both manually, by activating one of the application icons, and automatically, by inputting a portion of the destination.

As stated by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, "Siitonen does not disclose that the user interface comprises a home screen component from which to invoke a feature from among a plurality of features provided by the device and where in the component to compose a destination is invokable from the home screen component automatically in response to an input from the key-based input device of a portion of the destination." Siitonen also does not disclose the component to compose a destination being invokable from the home screen component manually by activating a communication application icon. Thus, Siitonen does not disclose either of the options recited in amended claim 1.

Hawkins discloses a contacts screen from which a lookup can be initiated by inputting information, such as the name of a contact. The contacts screen disclosed in Hawkins also includes "on-screen controls 602 for activating other functions of the device" (Emphasis added, see Hawkins column 16, lines 62-63). The on-screen controls disclosed in Hawkins necessarily do not include an icon for invoking a composition screen as that is the function of the contacts screen and hence, invoking a composition screen could not be considered an other function. Thus, Hawkins does not teach or suggest a screen from which a component to compose a destination for an outgoing communication can be initiated manually by activating a communication application icon as recited in amended claim 1.

The "home screen" taught in Wagner does not include a mobile status portion as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application. Furthermore, while the home screen disclosed in Wagner does appear to include a number of application icons, the

Applicant can find no reference in Wagner to a communication application icon for invoking a component to compose a destination as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, none of the references cited by the Examiner discloses a home screen which includes a communication application icon for invoking a component to compose a destination as recited in amended claim 1. Furthermore, even if such an icon did exist, the references fail to teach or suggest the combination taught in the current application, namely a component to compose a destination which is invokable from the home screen component manually by activating a communication application icon and automatically in response to an input from the first input device of a portion of the destination.

Thus, with proper consideration of the language of the claims, Siitonen, Hawkins and Wagner, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited by the present claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claimed subject matter includes a combination of features that are neither taught nor suggested by Siitonen, Hawkins and/or Wagner and that amended claim 1 is not obvious in view of Siitonen, Hawkins and/or Wagner. Independent claims 12 and 24 recite similar features and are patentable over Siitonen, Hawkins and/or Wagner for the same reasons. Dependent claims 2, 4-11 and 13, and 15-23 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 or 12 and are patentable for the same reasons.

Favourable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions in connection with the Applicant's submissions, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

OGILVY RENAULT LLP

Date: March 17, 2009

By /mve/
Michael Van Eesbeek
Registration No. 61,951
Telephone (416) 216-4020
Fax (216) 216-3930

OGILVY RENAULT LLP
Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower
200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2Z4
Canada